

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 24, 2003. Claims 13 to 22 are pending in the application, with Claims 1 to 12 having been canceled and Claims 13 to 22 having been amended. Claims 13 and 18 are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

It is noted that this amendment has been prepared in accordance with the Patent Office's revised format for amendments and therefore, where appropriate, waiver of the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.121 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,259,548 (Fahey), and Claims 1 to 3, 6, 7 to 9 and 12 were rejected under § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,748,078 (Escolar). In addition, Claims 1 to 4, 7, 10 and 13 to 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,537,104 (Van Dort) in view of Escolar, and Claims 5 and 11 were rejected under § 103(a) over Van Dort in view of Escolar and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,307,842 (Nakata). Without conceding the propriety of the rejections, Claims 1 to 12 have nonetheless been cancelled, thereby obviating the rejections of those claims. As to Claims 13 to 22, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following comments are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns warning information in electronic devices. According to the invention, when a warning status is detected, if the detected warning status is not released, warning information is transmitted to a registered device, and if the warning status is not released in spite of the warning information being transmitted to the registered device, the warning information is transmitted to an unregistered device. As a result, the warning information is provided to a device even if the warning status is not released.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 13 is an electronic device, comprising a detecting unit adapted to detect that a warning status has occurred, a warning unit adapted to notify to a user that the warning status has occurred, and a communication unit adapted to transmit warning information indicating that the warning status has occurred, wherein, if the detected warning status is not released, the communication unit is adapted to transmit the warning information to a registered device that is registered in the electronic device, and wherein, if the detected warning status is not released in spite of transmitting the warning information to the registered device, the communication unit is adapted to transmit the warning information to an unregistered device that is not registered in the electronic device.

Amended independent Claim 18 is a method claim that substantially corresponds to Claim 13.

The applied art, alone or in combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of amended independent Claims 13 and 18. In particular, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of, if a detected warning status is not released, transmitting warning information to a registered device, and if the detected warning status is not released in spite of transmitting the warning information to the registered device, transmitting the warning information to an unregistered device.

Van Dort is merely seen to disclose that, when a device changes state, messages are retrieved from a memory and transmitted to other devices. However, Van Dort is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of, if a detected warning status is not released, transmitting warning information to a registered device, and if the detected warning status is not released in spite of transmitting the warning information to the registered device, transmitting the warning information to an unregistered device.

Escobar is merely seen to disclose that an alarm alerting device 12 shown in Fig. 1 notifies devices listed in a list 48 that an alarm has occurred. Thus, Escobar merely

notifies registered devices (i.e., devices contained in the list) of the alarm, but is not seen to disclose or to suggest notifying unregistered devices even if a registered device is notified, but the warning status is still not released. Accordingly, Escolar is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 13 and 18.


Fahey and Nakata are not seen to add anything to overcome the foregoing deficiencies of Van Dort and Escolar and are not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of, if a detected warning status is not released, transmitting warning information to a registered device, and if the detected warning status is not released in spite of transmitting the warning information to the registered device, transmitting the warning information to an unregistered device.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of Claims 13 to 22 are believed to be allowable over the applied art.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 64127 v 1